

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed October 19, 2004.

### Drawings

The drawings are objected to for various informalities. Specifically, Figure 1 was rejected to for failing to include a reference number for the internal bus mentioned in the specification. Additionally, Figure 3 was objected to for failing to indicate various features mentioned in the specification. Corrected drawings are provided herewith. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the drawings are now in compliance with the rules.

With regard to the Office Action's objection to Figure 2 missing reference number "290" as recited on page 15 of Applicant's disclosure, Applicant submits that the wrong reference number was used on page 15 of the disclosure. The reference number "290" has been deleted and the correct reference number, "140", has been inserted in a corrected version of the disclosure filed herewith.

### Specification

The specification is objected to for failing to mention Figure 4 in the "Brief Description of the Drawings" and in the "Detailed Description" sections of Applicant's disclosure. Paragraph 10 of the "Brief Description of the Drawings" section already includes a description of Figure 4, and Applicant has amended paragraph 21 of the "Detailed Description" section to refer to Figure 4.

### 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11-15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, claims 2 and 11 were rejected but are now cancelled. Also, claims 4 and 13 are rejected because the Examiner asserts that the limitation, "said saved value being stored within said memory image" is not related to the comparing operation recited earlier in claims 4 and 13. Applicant submits that not such requirement exists in the rules or the MPEP. Claims 4 and 13 are claiming a comparison operation between the saved value and the initial value, both of which have proper antecedent basis. Claims 4 and 13 go on to further describe that the saved value mentioned in claims 4 and 13 are stored in the memory image. Applicant invites Examiner to point out the particular rule or MPEP section that requires all limitations mentioned in a claim to be related to all other limitations mentioned in the claim.

Claims 6 was rejected for lacking proper antecedent basis in regard to the limitation, "initializing value". Claim 6 is presently amended to replace the word "initializing" with the word, "initial", which has proper antecedent basis.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are presently in condition for allowance.

### 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-29 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Juffa (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,117) in view of Temple (U.S. Patent No.

5,875,342). Specifically, the Office Action alleges that Juffa teaches a memory image (as recited in claims 2 and 11) and mask storage area (as recited in claims 20 and 26). However, the memory image and mask storage area, as intended by Applicant, is a location in a memory structure, such as dynamic random access memory (DRAM), according to one embodiment of the invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 have been amended to reflect a memory image (in the case of claims 1 and 10) or, alternatively, a mask storage area (in the case of claims 19 and 25) stored in DRAM.

Juffa, on the other hand arguably suggests a mask storage area, but does not teach, suggest, nor provide motivation for a memory image. However, in order to more clearly claim these elements, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 to recite that these elements reside in DRAM, which Juffa does not teach. It is respectfully submitted by Applicant that the qualifier of the memory image being in DRAM is not necessary to overcome Juffa, since Juffa does not teach a memory image as defined in view of Applicant's disclosure. The added limitation of the memory image being stored in DRAM is purely intended by Applicant to clarify what is meant by the term "memory image".

Because Juffa neither teaches, suggests, nor provides motivation for a memory image/mask storage area representation of the registers disclosed in Juffa, as claimed in presently amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 25, it is respectfully submitted by Applicant that Juffa cannot be used as a basis for an obviousness rejection under 35 USC §103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 10, 19, and 25, and all claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees due, please charge them to our Deposit Account

No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 15, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John Patrick Ward  
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300